

convictions because you can't believe that someone of these views belongs on the court, now is that time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON of Florida pertaining to the introduction of S-1168 are printed in today's RECORD under "Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE CHARLES R. SIMPSON III

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an ambassador of the law. Charles R. Simpson III, judge of the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky, is a renowned fixture of the legal community in his home state as well as a world traveler, in his capacity as a member of the Committee on International Judicial Relations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. In that role, he serves as both a student and a teacher in courtrooms all over the world.

Judge Simpson is also an old friend of mine. He graduated from my alma mater, the University of Louisville, where he received both his bachelor's degree in 1967 and his law degree in 1970. Soon afterwards, we both helped found the law firm of Levin, Yussman, McConnell & Simpson. Obviously it was not the last stop for either of us.

After serving the public in county government, where I also served, Judge Simpson was appointed to the District Court by President Ronald Reagan in 1986. He has retained that post for nearly 20 years, rising to become one of the most respected voices in Louisville and throughout the State. But he also wanted to take his legal knowledge and his love of Kentucky and spread it beyond America's borders.

Dating to a period in his youth when he studied painting and architecture in Europe, Chuck has enjoyed an adventurer's spirit. So he spearheaded the establishment of a sister-court relationship between his court and one in Croatia. Through this friendship, Cro-

atians got a firsthand look at American jurisprudence, and Judge Simpson learned how the law deals with the difficulties of life in Eastern Europe.

Because of his groundbreaking efforts, Chief Justice of the United States William H. Rehnquist appointed Judge Simpson to the Committee on International Judicial Relations of the Judicial Conference of the United States in 2004. His wide travels have included countries such as Russia, Croatia, Slovenia and Cyprus.

Once on a visit to Ivanovo, Russia, Judge Simpson caused a minor international incident when he accidentally locked himself in the courtroom cage usually reserved for the defendant. Apparently, it was quite difficult to find the key. Everyone handled the situation with great humor, and Chuck struck a blow for diplomacy when his story made the front page of the local Ivanovo newspaper.

In 1999 Judge Simpson was named outstanding alumnus of the University of Louisville's Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, and in 2000 the Louisville Bar Association named him judge of the year. He and his wife Clare have three children, one of whom, their daughter Pam, has served with distinction for 2 years in my Washington office.

For his decades of service, the Kentucky Bar Association has named Chuck the 2005 outstanding judge of the year. They recognize that he is a superb representative of the American justice system to our friends across the world, and the knowledge he brings home from his travels enriches us all. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Judge Simpson for receiving this high honor, and for his service to the law and his country.

NOMINATION OF JOHN BOLTON TO BE UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I will be voting against the nomination of John Bolton to be Ambassador to the United Nations.

When the President first nominated Mr. Bolton for this position, I expressed deep disappointment and concern. First, because of his repeated expression of disdain for the organization. But, more importantly, because Mr. Bolton is as responsible as any member of the administration for the needless confrontations with the rest of the world and for the international isolation that plagued President Bush's first term and for the shaky credibility we carry today. At a time when we need to be strengthening our alliances and making full use of international institutions to achieve our foreign policy goals, sending Mr. Bolton to the United Nations sends the exact wrong message. I do not accept his view that the U.N. is a vehicle to be used by the U.S. "when it suits our interests and we can get others to go along." Diplo-

macy in most people's minds requires attention to more than just coalitions of the willing.

Over the past month, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has uncovered a pattern of behavior on the part of Mr. Bolton that has only confirmed my concerns. Most disturbing to me is the evidence of Mr. Bolton's troubled and confrontational relationship with our intelligence community.

In speeches and testimony, he has appeared to stretch the available intelligence to fit his preconceived views. On three separate occasions, he tried to inflate language characterizing our intelligence assessments regarding Syria's nuclear activities. He sought to exaggerate the intelligence community's views about Cuba's possible biological weapons activities. His track record, on these and other matters, was so bad that the Deputy Secretary of State made an extraordinary order—that Mr. Bolton could not give any testimony or speech that was not personally cleared by the Deputy Secretary or the Secretary's chief of staff.

He also dampened critical debates among professionals on important policy issues by retaliating against analysts who presented a different point of view than his own. For example, on three occasions over a 6 month period, he sought to remove a midlevel analyst who disputed the language he tried to use about Cuba. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is a serious matter. I would not criticize Mr. Bolton for asking intelligence analysts hard questions about proliferation issues, nor should policy makers refrain from challenging the assumptions of those analysts. But Mr. Bolton was doing something far different. He made it clear that he expected intelligence analyses that conformed with his preconceived policy views. Rather than welcome contrary intelligence analyses as essential to an informed debate, he retaliated against those who offered contrary views.

Mr. Bolton's approach to those around him has been harshly criticized by those who have worked with him. Larry Wilkerson, the chief of staff for Secretary Powell, called him a "lousy leader." Carl Ford, former head of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, referred to Mr. Bolton as a "quintessential kiss-up, kick-down sort of guy."

This is not the person we need at the United Nations. Good diplomacy, like good business, relies on a great team and a good leader. Good leaders listen. They listen to their troops, they make reasoned decisions, they take responsibility, and they build the respect and loyalty of their staff. Management by fear is a recipe, in both public service and the private sector, for getting only the information that you want to hear. Shoot the messenger and other messengers will not volunteer to deliver the bad news. And I submit that Mr. Bolton has developed a reputation for shooting the messenger.

We must begin to learn the lessons of Iraq. It should be more than clear by now that our national interests are damaged when policy makers bend intelligence. And we should all understand by now that accurate, objective intelligence requires analysts who are free to offer differing views. We face serious threats, from international terrorism to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We have serious foreign policy concerns to address, from genocide to global climate change. Protecting our national security interests demands policymakers who seek objective intelligence on these and other challenges. Given his track record, John Bolton is clearly not that policymaker.

Another lesson of Iraq is the critical importance of American credibility. The inaccurate presentations made by our Government to the international community have done serious damage to our interests. If we are to gain the active support of other nations in confronting common threats such as terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, we will need to convince those nations of our views. To do so, we will need their trust. This challenge is especially complicated at the United Nations, where Secretary of State Colin Powell gave what turned out to be an almost entirely inaccurate presentation on Iraq, and where the administration dismissed all alternative views, including those of UN inspectors. Mr. Bolton is not the person to repair this damage. His record makes it extremely unlikely that he could rebuild our credibility in the international community in its most visible forum—the U.N.

The nomination of John Bolton is a lost opportunity for this administration to regain American leadership at the United Nations. It is also dangerous. Failure to gain support in the UN for our policies puts us at unnecessary risk. Simply put, we cannot afford an ineffective Ambassador at the United Nations.

COMMENDING RICHARD PRICE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I rise to commend and thank Mr. Richard Price of the Congressional Research Service, CRS, for his many years of outstanding service to the U.S. Congress. In June, Mr. Price is retiring from CRS after 32 years of service. For over three decades at CRS, Mr. Price has played a significant role in providing assistance to Congress in analyzing major health care legislation. In his position at CRS, he has been an invaluable asset not only through his own work analyzing health care legislation, but also in his tireless efforts to guide others in the Health Care and Medicine unit at CRS which he managed.

Over the past three decades, Mr. Price has worked on health care legislation across a wide array of health care policy and programs. Mr. Price is

a recognized expert on the major U.S. health care financing programs—Medicare and Medicaid; his particular areas of expertise span most aspects of Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement policy, long-term care, Medicaid eligibility, nursing home reform, managed care, hospice care, skilled nursing home services, end stage renal disease, home health care services, and public health service programs, among many others. His contributions to the development of legislation in these areas have been substantial. Over his long career at CRS, he has helped hundreds of staff understand the effect of the legislative proposals being considered through thoughtful analyses, balanced presentations, and clear explanations. I wish to especially thank him for his work with the Senate Finance Committee and its staff.

In addition to his own analytic work on legislative analysis, Mr. Price has been responsible for management of a staff of CRS analysts who assist Congress across a wide spectrum of health care issues, including those related to Medicare, Medicaid, the Public Health Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Veterans Administration. Mr. Price was instrumental in building the health care staff of CRS to a large team of senior analysts. In addition, Mr. Price has been involved in innumerable projects to develop the capacity of CRS analysts to evaluate and analyze health care data, including models to estimate the effect of various legislative changes in Medicare and other health care programs.

Other organizations that analyze issues related to health care policy have acknowledged Mr. Price's accomplishments and knowledge of U.S. health care policy. For example, Mr. Price is a member of the steering committee of the National Health Policy Forum, a nonpartisan organization that provides research to senior level health policy makers in Washington. Mr. Price is also a member of the prestigious National Academy on Social Insurance, NASI.

Mr. Price's service to Congress in the analysis and development of policy alternatives across a wide array of health care programs, his ability to conceptualize complex public policy issues, as well as his leadership of staff who work on many varied and complex health care issues, set the highest standards for assistance provided by CRS in service to the Congress. He will be missed, both here in Congress and across the street at the Library of Congress.

RETIREMENT OF GEORGE W. MULLEN

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to honor George W. Mullen of Pennsylvania, who will step down as State Adjutant of the Pennsylvania Department of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States this

June. George's retirement will mark the end of a distinguished 59 year career of service to our military, our veterans community, and our Nation.

George W. Mullen joined the United States Navy in 1943 at the age of 17 and served during World War II aboard the merchant ship *SS Ben Holt* and the destroyer *USS Cotton* in both the Atlantic and Pacific Theatres. While on active duty aboard the *Holt*, his ship arrived 2 days after the invasion of Normandy, France, to help supply Allied forces in the battle against Germany. His duty on the *Cotton* included helping rescue a downed American pilot and supporting the invasion of Okinawa.

George worked at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Coatesville for 35 years before becoming the Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars State Adjutant in 1983. As a member of the Pennsylvania War Veterans Council and the Pennsylvania State Veterans Commission, he has been a familiar face to governors and many State and Federal legislators who have sought his guidance.

Mr. Mullen, who lives in Parkesburg, has touched many lives and that has not gone unnoticed. He has been honored at the local, State and national level for his many contributions. While humble in service to others, George has always stood for what is right and remains a staunch supporter of our troops.

His will be hard shoes to fill, and he will be missed. We wish George and his wife Dawn well in future endeavors, and thank him for his dedication to duty, hard work, and professionalism.

ONLINE FREEDOM OF SPEECH ACT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Online Freedom of Speech Act which my colleague Senator REID has introduced. This legislation clarifies the campaign finance legislation of 2002 in order to restore freedom of speech to the Internet.

The Internet is more than a remarkable new technology. It's a means of bringing people together. I read somewhere that the most important time in a person's development is the first 5 years. Things that happen during infancy have dramatic effects on how that child will develop for the rest of their life. The Internet is no different. It is a technology in its infancy. We are fortunate to live in an exciting time of great technological change. In my State of Montana, cutting-edge technology is creating jobs and industry. But like anything in its infancy, we should be very careful about how we respond to technological infants like the Internet. A wrong step now could affect how it develops for the next 100 years.

For this reason, the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 did not identify the Internet as a target of regulation. However, it also did not specifically exclude it. When the FEC decided how to enforce the regulatory measures of the new law, they erred on the side of caution and exempted the Internet from their regulatory scope.

The fruits of that decision have been profound. According to a Pew Internet